

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the subject application as amended. In response to the Final Office Action mailed 03/23/2009, Applicant is filing this amendment. Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 10, 12, 15 and 16 are pending.

The Examiner has rejected claims 6, 7, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Applicant submits that the various text noted by the Examiner have been deleted. Accordingly, Applicant requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected pending claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 10, 12, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Keller et al. (U.S. Patent 6,714,994; “Keller”). Applicant has noted the Examiner’s comments regarding the first node and the second node supporting coherent and non-coherent traffic. In reply, applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 10 to clearly recite that the nodes support packet traffic for transfer of packets, coherent traffic to access local and remote memory and non-coherent traffic to communicate with input/output (I/O) circuitry. Furthermore, when the second node receives a packet from an external source that is to access a coherent fabric of the memory, the second bridge identifies the first node as a remote node and converts the packet as an uncacheable data access request to the first node so that the uncacheable data access request does not access a coherent fabric in the second node. When the first bridge receives the uncacheable data access request, the first bridge identifies the uncacheable data access request as a local access request to the memory in the first node and processes the uncacheable data access request from the second node as a coherent data access request in the first node to access the coherent fabric of the memory in the first node.

Applicant has noted the relevant portions of Keller cited by the Examiner, but submits that Keller discloses conveying packets between a coherent processing subsystem and a non-coherent I/O subsystem by converting coherent packets to non-coherent packets and vice versa (see Abstract of Keller). However, Keller fails to disclose the elements of the amended claims, as noted in the above paragraph.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Keller does not anticipate the embodiments of the invention as now claimed in the amended claims and Applicant requests the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection based on Keller.

Accordingly, Applicant solicits the Examiner for the allowance of pending claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 10, 12, 15 and 16, as amended.

If there are any fee shortages related to this response, please charge such fee shortages to Deposit Account No. 50-2126.

Respectfully submitted,

GARLICK, HARRISON & MARKISON
(Customer No. 51472)

Date: 06/23/2009

By: /William W. Kidd; Reg. No. 31,772/
William W. Kidd
Reg. No. 31,772
Phone: (512) 263-1842
Fax No: (512) 263-1469
Email: wkidd@texaspatents.com